

Docket No.: 243469US2

## OBLON SPIVAK MCCLELLAND MATER & NEUSTADT P.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/677,346

Applicants: Masashi NAGAYAMA, et al.

Filing Date: October 3, 2003

For: IMAGE REMOVING METHOD, IMAGE REMOVING

DEVICE, AND IMAGE FORMING APPARATUS

Group Art Unit: 1756

Examiner: Goodrow, John L.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

## **Provisional Election**

Our check in the amount of \$0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,

MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier

Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone) (703) 413-2220 (fax) Surinder Sachar

Registration No. 34,423

JUN 2 3 2005 JUN 2

**DOCKET NO: 243469US2** 

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF

MASASHI NAGAYAMA, ET AL. : EXAMINER: GOODROW, J. L.

SERIAL NO: 10/677,346

FILED: OCTOBER 3, 2003 : GROUP ART UNIT: 1756

FOR: IMAGE REMOVING METHOD, IMAGE REMOVING DEVICE, AND IMAGE FORMING APPARATUS

## PROVISIONAL ELECTION

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated May 31, 2005, Applicants elect the invention of Group I, identifying Claims 1-9 as readable thereon.

The Restriction Requirement is respectfully traversed based on MPEP §803, which states:

... If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.

The claims of the present invention would appear to be part of an overlapping search area. Accordingly, the outstanding Restriction Requirement is respectfully traversed on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner.

Application No. 10/677,346 Reply to Office Action of May 31, 2005

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Requirement to elect a single invention be withdrawn, and that a full examination on the merits of Claims 1-28 be conducted.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{Customer Number} \\ 22850 \end{array}$ 

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 06/04) Gregory J. Maier Attorney of Record Registration No. 25,599

Surinder Sachar Registration No. 34,423

I:\atty\et\243469US\243469US.RESTRICTION\_6.30.05.DOC